

TDC Blue Ribbon Committee
January 9, 2008 Meeting Minutes Final

Members Present: ECOSLO- Maria Lorca; Templeton Area Advisory Group - Nicholas Marquart; Subdivision Review Board, Public Works – Richard Marshall ; Sierra Club – Susan Harvey; General Public – Melissa Boggs; General Public - Christine Volbrecht ;City of San Luis Obispo – Kim Murry; Development Firm – Denis Sullivan; South County Advisory Council - Jesse Hill; Subdivision Review Board, Air Pollution Control Board – Aeron Arlin Genet; Ag Liaison – Mark Pearce; Farm Bureau – Joy Fitzhugh; Land Conservancy – “BK” Bruce Richard; City of Paso Robles- Ron Whisenand

Members Absent: Existing TDC receiver site – Chad Whittstrom; Active Agriculturalist – Charles Whitney

Committee Staff Present: Karen Nall and Kami Griffin, Planning and Building

Others Present: Robert Hill- Land Conservancy, Lynda Auchinachie, Dorothy Jennings, Eric Greening, and Sue Luft

Richard Marshall opens the meeting.

Air Quality. Aeron Arlin Genet provides a presentation on air quality for the County. Discussion ensues. Maria Lorca questions the UPlan mapping. Aeron Arlin Genet notes that she has not yet been able to get the data but would like to provide a presentation to the group at a latter date. Bob Hill notes the difficulty of quantifying the “cost of sprawl”.

Antiquated Subdivisions. Karen Nall and Kami Griffin provide an overview of a draft study provided by the SLO Land Conservancy. Staff agrees with the finding of the study and recommends creating broader specific community study areas. Karen Nall adds that within the specific study areas, sending and receiving areas would be designated and in some cases commercial zoning could be added. Discussion ensues. Denis Sullivan notes that any “upzonings” would be through density transfers. Ron Whisenand suggests the use of CSD for the separate areas. Susan Harvey notes that the fees to develop in the cities are greater than in the rural areas. Kami Griffin notes that this could be a group recommendation to add fees in the rural areas to offset the cost of sprawl. Joy Fitzhugh notes that added fees in the rural areas will create problems for affordable housing and for long time property owners that do not have the larger income. Richard Marshall suggests relocating development to “near by area” to where the sprawl fees would not be required. Kami Griffin notes that she believes that this is a parcel size issue and suggests that sites that are compliant with the current ordinance for parcel sizes would not be the areas we would target as receiver sites. BK notes that for the TDC program fees are only applied for an increase in development. Ron Whisenand agrees that we need to add this as a recommendation to address impact to the cities and believes that the specific community plan is a good idea. Jesse Hill is concerned if the program is proposing to allow receiver site in agricultural lands once again. Denis Sullivan suggests staff to preparing a written proposal of the specific community plans areas. Chris Volbrecht questions whether there is still a need for the program. Kami Griffin notes that per the antiquated subdivision study they are only a few intact and worth saving Kami Griffin adds that although the protection of antiquated subdivisions was a primary goal of the program, the goals changes to protection of agriculture, natural resources and rural character. Nick Marquart notes that he likes where the group is headed but feels that there may be a lot more properties that have certificates of compliance already issued. Karen Nall notes that she believes that there is the need to continue the program to provide an option to development. Chris Volbrecht still has concerns with the overall program. Maria Lorca supports the use of community based programs. Joy Fitzhugh notes that there are

problem with the program and suggest that a land bank would need to be funded. Sue Harvey suggests determining the true cost of development and fees could be used to fund the bank. Eric Greening notes that cumulative impacts are not adequately address and that a fee could be assessed to mitigate cumulative impacts. Kami Griffin responds that much of the rural development is ministerial. Kami Griffin reviews Tract 19 and suggests that TDC could be used to construct secondary dwelling within the subdivision. Denis Sullivan suggests that community based plans should be included within the specific plan areas. Ron Whisenand suggests working together. BK suggests looking for new town sites. Maria Lorca questions how the specific plans process would work. Kami Griffin and Richard Marshall responds.

Program Goals

Richard Marshall opens the discussion regarding the expanded definitions for the program goals. Karen Nall notes that she has only received one definition from Kim Murry and Ron Whisenand regarding community separators and provides a handout to the group. Melissa Boggs notes she has drafted a definition for Natural Areas and Environmental Sensitive Areas and reads to the group. Sue Harvey notes that the “Blue Booklet” 1995 previously provided has a good definition regarding ag criteria. Chris Volbrecht questions why we are expanding the language. Richard Marshall responds today’s exercise is to define what we are trying to protect and that the goal language will guide future user to protect these area. Karen Nall explained that the previous meeting the group agreed on the 5 goals but wanted to expand the definitions. Maria Lorca suggests adding a goal to protect air and water resources. Jesse Hill notes that by adding community separators will cause density to leap frog. Aeron Arlin Genet suggests adding language to prevent sprawl. Dorothy Jennings suggests adding specific definitions for natural areas plan which is a part of the Ag and Open Space Element. She also notes that the community separators and the receiving sites within 5 mile of an urban area are in conflict. Denis Sullivan question whether the group is suggesting eliminating the 5 mile circles due to the potential conflict with the community separators. Discussion ensues.

The minutes from December 5, 2007 are approved. Karen Nall request the October 3rd minutes not be approved at this time as she has additional changes and will send out to the group.

Group discusses expanded goal definitions. Anyone who has language may forward to Karen Nall and she will forward to the group prior to the next meeting.

Richard Marshall requests public comment. Sue Harvey questions the remaining meeting schedule. Discussion ensues. Chris Volbrecht suggests formalizing what changes the group wants to make to the program. Discussion ensues. Dorothy Jennings suggests community based plans and regional plans. BK Richards announces a meeting the Land Conservancy is holding regarding conservation following our next meeting at 6:00 at the Monday Club. Jesse Hill notes that at the last NCAC meeting a TDC project was presented and Dana Lilley presented the affordable housing fee.

Next Meeting – January 23, 2008 at 3:00.